

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 15-17, and 19-24 are pending in the present application, Claims 1, 15-17, and 19-24 having been amended, and Claim 18 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 15-17, and 19-24 is found, for example, in paragraphs [0063], [0070], and [0079]-[0082] of the published version of the present application (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0007401). Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, 1-4 and 15-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as an anticipated by Cloutier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,586, hereinafter Cloutier).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Cloutier, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to Claim 1 overcomes this ground of rejection.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

said remote information processing apparatus configured to acquire said urgent mail including said attached file from said mail server, in response to receiving said acquisition instructing signal transmitted from said mobile communication terminal by a receiving unit in said remote information processing apparatus, said receiving unit is configured to output a wake-up instruction to a power control unit to force the power control unit to supply power to respective circuits of the remote information processing apparatus.

Cloutier does not disclose or suggest at least these elements of amended Claim 1.

In a non-limiting embodiment of the invention defined by Claim 1, the information processing apparatus may be operating in a sleep mode (i.e., a mode in which some circuits are powered down). If it is determined that the information processing apparatus is operating in a sleep mode, the wireless interface of the information processing apparatus outputs a

wake-up instruction to the power control unit 36, forcing the power control unit 36 to start supplying power to respective circuits of the information processing unit.¹

The outstanding Office Action appears to take the position that the remote information processing apparatus corresponds to messaging system server 120. However, Cloutier does not disclose or suggest that messaging system server 120 includes a receiving unit configured to output a wake-up instruction to a power control unit to force the power control unit to supply power to respective circuits of the remote information processing apparatus. Cloutier merely describes that messaging server 120 retrieves portions of email messages from remote email server 110.² The receipt of this partial email message does not cause a receiving unit of server 120 to output a wake-up instruction to a power control unit of the server 120 to force the power control unit to supply power to respective circuits of the information processing apparatus.

Server 120 also receives messages from user interface 140 and wireless device 170. However, Cloutier does not disclose or suggest messages received from user interface 140 or wireless device 170 cause a receiving unit of server 120 to output a wake-up instruction to a power control unit of the server 120 to force the power control unit to supply power to respective circuits of the information processing apparatus.

Thus, Cloutier does not disclose or suggest the claimed "said remote information processing apparatus configured to acquire said urgent mail including said attached file from said mail server, in response to receiving said acquisition instructing signal transmitted from said mobile communication terminal by a receiving unit in said remote information processing apparatus, said receiving unit is configured to output a wake-up instruction to a power control unit to force the power control unit to supply power to respective circuits of the remote information processing apparatus."

¹ Published specification, paragraph [0081].

² Cloutier, col. 5, lines 1-5.

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Cloutier. Claim 21 recites elements similar to those of amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 21 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguish over Cloutier, for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

Claim 15 also patentably distinguishes over Cloutier. Claim 15 recites, "a sound generation unit configured to generate a predetermined mail-arrival sound from a speaker of the mobile communication terminal in response to reception of the mail-arrival notifying signal. No component in the system of Cloutier generates a predetermined mail-arrival sound in response to reception of the mail-arrival notifying signal.

Particularly, it is noted that the outstanding Office Action equates wireless device 170 to the mobile communication terminal of Claim 15. However, Cloutier does not disclose or suggest that wireless device 170 generates a predetermined mail-arrival sound in response to reception of the mail-arrival notifying signal.


Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguishes over Cloutier.

Application No. 09/853,325
Reply to Office Action of October 25, 2007

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradely D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796

I:\ATTY\UW\275756\US\275576\US_AM DUE 10-31-07.DOC